



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/103,110 | 06/23/1998 | STEVEN R. ESKILDSEN | 042390.P5444 | 2641 |

7590 03/24/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR AND ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD
7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

DINH, TUAN T

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| | 2827 |

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/103,110 | ESKILDSEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Tuan T Dinh | 2827 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 25-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 25-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Disposition of Claims

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The request filed on 12/10/02 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/103,110 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 25-36 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-3 of U. S. Patent No. 6,250,934 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: applicant uses the same term "a first receptacle" or "a casing" both performs the same function of "receiving" or "encasing" an IC package. Yet, applicant uses the term "upper opening" as a "first opening" and "back opening" as

a "second opening". The first receptacle or "casing" defines the first and second openings that used to cover and protect the IC package when the IC package is inserted into "the first receptacle or casing"

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 25-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnworth et al. (U. S. Patent 5,892,660) in view of Ringer et al. (U. S. Patent 5,408,386).

As to claims 25-30, Farnworth discloses an apparatus for use in a data processing device as shown in figures 1-12, comprising:

an integrated circuit (IC) package (10-figure 1, column 4, line 8, and 60-figure 3, column 4, line 41) having a plurality of leads (13, column 4, line 14) from the IC package;

a first receptacle (40, column 4, line 32) for receiving the IC package and provide a physical and electrostatic discharge protection for the IC package, the first receptacle including a first opening (a front surface opening of a chamber 41) to receive the plurality of leads (13) when the IC package is inserted into the first receptacle through a second opening (a bottom opening of a side wall 44) disposed away from the first opening; the IC package inserted into the first receptacle (40) from a bottom of the first receptacle using a rotating movement; at least one stop (142, 144-figure 9) disposed at the second opening to securely hold the IC package within the first receptacle and

a second receptacle (202-figure 11, column 6, line 39) disposed on the data processing device for receiving the first receptacle (200, column 6, line 38), the second receptacle having a plurality of contacts (connector 204, column 6, line 40),

wherein the plurality leads of the IC package (10; 60) directly contact, via the first opening, with the plurality of contacts of the second receptacle respectively when the first receptacle is inserted into the second receptacle.

Farnworth does not teach the leads extended from the IC package. Ringer shows an IC package (13) having extended leads (15) connected to contacts (41-figure 4) of a second receptacle (12, 14-figures 1-2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have teaching of Ringer to employ the apparatus of Farnworth in order to provide electrical connections between the IC package fixed into a receptacle of a computer.

Regarding claims 31-36, the method steps are necessitated by the apparatus structure as disclosed by Farnworth in view of Ringer.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T Dinh whose telephone number is 703-306-5856. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on 703-305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-1341 for regular communications and 703-305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



TD
March 22, 2003

DAVID L. TALBOTT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800